CHARLES B. RANGEL
15TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT
NEW YORK
DEPUTY WHIP

COMMITTEE:

WAYS AND MEANS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN
RESOURCES
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRADE

JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

Congress of the United States House of Representatives Washington, DC 20515-3215

April 8, 1996

2354 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING WASHINGTON, DC 20515-3215 TELEPHONE: (202) 225-4385

DISTRICT OFFICES:

MS. VIVIAN E. JONES DISTRICT ADMINISTRATOR

163 WEST 125TH STREET NEW YORK, NY 10027 TELEPHONE: (212) 663-3900

2110 First Avenue New York, NY 10029 Telephone: (212) 348-9630

PLEASE RESPOND TO

Federal Election Commission Office of General Counsel 999 E Street, NW Washington, DC 20463

Attn: N. Bradley Litchfield, Associate General Counsel

Re: AOR 1996-12

Dear Mr. Litchfield:

Comment On = 000 Commen

RECEIVED RECEIVED FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNTY EL

I would like to thank you for the extension of the deadline for additional comments on Dr. Fulani's Advisory Opinion Request. As per your conversation with Ms. Santiago on April 8, 1996, you agreed to extend the deadline to April 12, 1996.

I am writing to comment on the questions posed to the Federal Election Commission by Dr. Lenora B. Fulani in her Advisory Opinion Request that you have designated AOR 1996-12.

I have previously written the Commissioners regarding my concerns about the criteria used by the Commission in the initial repayment determination it issued to Dr. Fulani last summer. In my letter of March 15, 1996, to Chairwoman Elliot, I said:

The novel standard of "non-arms length" to describe and delegitimize the relationships between Dr. Fulani's campaign committee and some of her vendors was, in my opinion, a problematic departure from the Commission's normal standards, which would not only have unfairly injured Dr. Fulani, but would have set a dangerous and disabling precedent for other candidates and campaigns.

This AOR gives the Commission the opportunity to set a positive and clarifying precedent regarding its review of candidates' expenditures.

I urge the Commission to commit itself in this advisory opinion to using only objective criteria set forth in statutes and regulations to determine whether expenditures are "qualified" expenses. Subjective terms like "arms length" and "solely for the benefit of the collective" have no proper place in election law enforcement, and especially not if invoked in a selective, ad hoc, and apparently discriminatory manner.

Based on these principles, Dr. Fulani's first question should be answered affirmatively, and her questions 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, and 14 should be answered in the negative. So far as questions 16-19 are concerned, I think that the FEC should not use the criterion "not at arms length" at all. If the Commision thinks there is some need for a concept like this to effectuate the federal campaign finance laws, then it should issue a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and set forth a rationale for clearly defined rules of general applicability to fulfill that need. But it is too late to apply any such concepts to the 1996 election campaign (let alone Dr. Fulani's 1992 expenditures).

Dr. Fulani is a recognized and respected leader who has won the respect of a great many people -- particularly African-Americans and women -- including those who may disagree with her political decisions. She has twice qualified for federal primary matching funds for her presidential campaigns. The Commission should issue an advisory opinion that leaves no doubt that she, and other candidates, including ones like her who represent traditionally excluded and underrepresented Americans, can participate in the federal campaign funding program in 1996 and in all future years without fear of being subjected to enforcement actions and repayment orders based on improper criteria.

Member of Con

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

cc: Congressional Black Caucus

Dr. Lenora Fulani

CBR/ms